DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 279 FL 016 540

AUTHOR	Wesche, M.; And Others
TITLE	Post-Secondary Follow-up of Former French Immersion Students in the Ottawa Area: A Pilot Study.
INSTITUTION	Ottawa Univ. (Ontario). Centre for Second Language Learning.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Oct 86
NOTE	98p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Environment; College Students; Correlation; Evaluation Criteria; Followup Studies; Foreign Countries; *French; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *High School Graduates; *Immersion Programs; *Language Attitudes; *Language Maintenance; *Language Proficiency; Language Usage; Pilot Projects; Postsecondary Education; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Second Language Learning; State Universities; Student Records
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario (Ottawa)

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes findings of a pilot study of 1985 graduates of bilingual high school programs at the University of Ottawa and Carleton, Queen's, and McGill Universities. Data on French language proficiency, attitudes toward the French language, and current patterns of French use at the universities are compared for early and late immersion students and for two of the universities' samples. A major objective of the study was to develop and refine a methodology and battery of instruments for postsecondary followup studies of immersion graduates for use throughout Canada. Procedures and instruments for tracing and locating subjects, measurement and self-evaluation of French proficiency, and archival data-gathering in the postsecondary institutions are described. A secondary objective was to describe postsecondary institutional response to the growing clientele of bilingual anglophone students, including French language course offerings, opportunities to use French, and institutional support and recognition of French language activity. The report includes a proposal for continuation of the followup of the pilot group and a later cohort. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280279

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Wesche
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

POST-SECONDARY FOLLOW-UP

OF FORMER FRENCH IMMERSION STUDENTS IN THE OTTAWA AREA :

A PILOT STUDY

October, 1986

Principal Investigator : M.Wesche

Project Staff : F.Morrison

C.Pawley

D.Ready

This project was funded by the Language Acquisition Development Program, Official Languages in Education of the Department of the Secretary of State.

FL016540

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to thank the following persons for their help with various aspects of this project:

Carleton University

Dr. David Brown
Dr. Juliette Kealey
Mr. Jim Sevigny

McGill University

Dr. Fred Genesee
Ms. Mariela Johansen
Dr. Naomi Holobow
Dr. Jacques Rebuffot

Queen's University

Dr. Suzanne Fortier

OISE

Dr. Birgit Harley
Dr. Sharon Lapkin

Ottawa Board of Education, Research Centre

Mrs. R.L.Cooper
Mrs. Jacqueline Murray

University of Ottawa

Mr. Yves Benac
Dr. H.P.Edwards
Mr. R.Lalonde
Dr. Joseph Lloyd-Jones
Mr. M.S.Vanniarajan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		pages
I	BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
	Introduction	
	Setting	
	Objectives	
II	METHODOLOGY	6
	Subjects	
	Tracing and Testing Procedures	
	Secondary Schools	
	University of Ottawa	
	Instruments : Pilot Battery	
	French Proficiency Tests	
	Self-Assessment Questionnaire	
	French Language Use Questionnaire, 1985	
	University of Ottawa Tracing Questionnaire	
	Revision of Instruments	
III	1985 FRENCH IMMERSION GRADUATES : DESCRIPTION	21
	French Language Proficiency	
	Self-Assessment of French Proficiency	
	French Language Use Patterns and Attitudes	
	Conclusions	
IV	INSTRUMENTS : REVISED BATTERY	46
	French Proficiency Tests	
	Self-Assessment Questionnaire	
	French Language Use Questionnaire	
	Applicability of Test Battery for Other Studies	
V	SURVEY OF POST-SECONDARY OPPORTUNITIES IN FRENCH FOR IMMERSION GRADUATES	52
	Carleton University	
	McGill University	
	Queen's University	
	University of Ottawa	
	Conclusions	

VI PROPOSAL FOR FIRST TWO YEARS OF A SIX YEAR LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF POST-SECONDARY EXPERIENCES OF FRENCH IMMERSION GRADUATES 64

Introduction
Purpose
Methodology
Subjects
Instruments
Overview of Plan for the Calendar Years 1987 and 1988

REFERENCES 72

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

			pages
Table	1	Early and Late Immersion Programs : OBE/CBE	7
Table	2	Pilot French Proficiency Tests	13
Table	3	Correlations Between French Proficiency and Self-Assessment Variables	14
Table	4	Correlations Between Anxiety and Other Self-Report Measures	16
Table	5	French Proficiency Written Test : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples	23
Table	6	French Proficiency Speaking Test : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples	25
Table	7	French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance	26
Table	8	French Proficiency Speaking Test : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance	27
Table	9	French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance	27
Table	10	French Proficiency Speaking Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance	28
Table	11	French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance	28
Table	12	Self-Assessment Measures : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples	30
Table	13	Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance	31
Table	14	Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance	32
Table	15	Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance	32

Table 16	Self-Report Measures : Descriptive Statistics, Total Samples and Subsamples	34
Table 17	Self-Report Measures : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance	35
Table 18	Self-Report Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance	36
Table 19	Self-Report Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance	37
Table 20	Specific Measures of French Language Use : Total Samples and Subsamples	39
Table 21	Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance	40
Table 22	Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance	41
Table 23	Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance	42
Table 24	Revised French Proficiency Tests	48
Table 25	Sheltered and Adjunct Courses in French for Anglophones	58
Table 26	Immersion Background of First Year Students at the University of Ottawa (1986-87)	61
Table 27	Survey of Student Reasons for Studying in French in Order of Frequency	62
Table 28	Survey of Student Reasons for Not Studying in French in Order of Frequency	63
Table 29	Study of Former French Immersion Students in the Ottawa Area	66
Table 30	Location of Key OBE/CBE Groups in Successive Academic Years	67

APPENDICES

Appendix A Survey of Immersion Programs Followed

Appendix B University of Ottawa Tracing Questionnaire

Appendix C Speaking Test Scoring Guidelines

Appendix D Statistical Data for the Revised Proficiency Test

Table A : Descriptive Statistics, Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement : Revised Version, Written French Proficiency Test

Table B : Item Characteristics : Revised Version, Written French Proficiency Test.

Table C : Item Characteristics : Proposed Reading Text and Retained Reading Text

Appendix E Revised French Language Use Questionnaire

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The post-secondary follow-up of former French immersion students in the Ottawa area was initiated because of a concern with the long-term effects of immersion education on their French language proficiency, language use patterns and language-related attitudes. While immersion programs of many types have been shown to lead to the development of good functional second language skills, discussion has intensified in recent years about the non-nativelike French of students, even after many years in immersion programs. There also appears to be a tendency among the majority of immersion students to reserve French for the classroom, even when opportunities are present to use French language media or to use French in social, employment-related and commercial contexts.

From an educational and social point of view, it is important to determine the extent to which graduates of immersion programs maintain and continue to develop their French language skills, the extent to which they integrate the use of their second language into their daily lives, and their related attitudes toward their two languages. Educational decision makers also need to know if there are long-term differences in the effects of early- versus middle- or late-entry immersion.

Since, as a group, the vast majority of graduates of bilingual secondary programs enter university, it is important to

find out which institutions and programs they choose, the extent to which the desire to use and improve their French skills enters into their decisions, and the influence of their perceptions of the importance of the French language on their future educational choices and their employment aspirations.

Furthermore, it is desirable to monitor the responses of post-secondary institutions to the second-language development needs of this new clientele. For the first time, English-language and bilingual institutions are receiving significant numbers of functionally bilingual Anglophone students, many of whom wish to continue their studies at least partially in French. Baseline information on currently existing French language opportunities for these students, and an ongoing study of new initiatives which are undertaken in the next few years will be of considerable interest to the educational community at large, as well as to students currently in immersion programs.

SETTING

The Ottawa region and Eastern Ontario are ideal for a study of the post-secondary effects of various immersion programs since this area was one of the first in Ontario to establish immersion programs. These programs, with accompanying research, have been ongoing since 1970. The present range of immersion programs offered in the region includes both early- and late-entry immersion, a half-and-half program through elementary school and bilingual programs at the secondary level. The Ottawa-Carleton

region is already graduating large numbers of Anglophone students from bilingual programs. The approximately 375 secondary bilingual-program students who completed grade 12 in 1984 included about 40 per cent of the original 1971 kindergarten-entry immersion cohort, as well as students from late immersion, local separate schools and other backgrounds (Morrison and Pawley 1986). Most of these graduated from grade 13 in 1985 and entered university that fall. It was found by both W.R.McGillivray (1986) and the Ottawa Board of Education Research Centre that Ottawa's bilingual University of Ottawa and English language Carleton University, together with Queen's and McGill Universities, were the institutions most often chosen by former immersion students from the Ottawa - Carleton area.

In 1985, funding of a one year pilot project - to be jointly carried out by the Centre for Second Language Learning (CSLL), University of Ottawa, and the Ottawa Board of Education Research Centre (OBE-RC) - was approved by the Secretary of State. This has made possible the study of 1985 Ottawa Board of Education (OBE) and Carleton Board of Education (CBE) bilingual high school graduates in their first year of study in the four universities mentioned above, as well as a small group of similar students at the University of Ottawa from other parts of the country.

OBJECTIVES

The pilot study reported below had several major objectives. The first was to gather baseline data on area graduates of bilingual high school programs who had previously completed

either early or late immersion programs. These data would describe their French proficiency skills (active/receptive, oral/written, social/academic), their attitudes toward the French language, and the patterns in their current use of French as related to their immersion background and post-graduation choice of university.

In view of the first objective, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the French language skills of these students at university entry (tested and self-reported)?
2. What are their attitudes toward their use of the French language, and other language-related issues?
3. Which post-secondary institutions do they choose? Is French a consideration?
4. To what extent do they pursue opportunities to maintain and develop their French language skills and how do their second-language use patterns evolve in various settings (educational, occupational, social and home) over the first year of study?
5. Can any identifiable differences in language skills, attitudes and use patterns be found at the first year university level between the following subgroups of students : (1) those who had early or late immersion, (2) those who choose a bilingual or an English-language university, (3) OBE/CBE immersion graduates and graduates from similar programs in other parts of Canada attending the University of Ottawa?

The second objective was to describe the French-language offerings currently available to these students in the four universities. These include courses in French as a second language, in French literature, or in other academic disciplines offered in French for Francophones or for Anglophones, exchange programs with French language institutions, special activities in French and other institutional initiatives. In other words, what advanced-level French-language offerings - including courses, activities, exchanges and other special programs - exist in the institutions chosen by significant numbers of former immersion students from the Ottawa region?

The third objective was to develop a methodology and instrumentation for gathering data which would be appropriate for a subsequent longitudinal study not only in the Ottawa-Carleton, Eastern Ontario area, but for use in post-secondary follow-up studies throughout Canada. This would include techniques for tracing and locating the students before and after graduation, development of tests and questionnaires, and development of procedures for gathering data on individuals and programs in the post-secondary institutions.

The fourth objective was to generate a proposal for a longitudinal study of immersion graduates at the post-secondary level to be carried out in the Ottawa region, ideally in conjunction with partner studies in other parts of Canada.

II. METHODOLOGY

SUBJECTS*

The subjects in the pilot study included two overlapping samples :

(1) 1985 former immersion graduates of bilingual high school programs in the Ottawa and Carleton Boards of Education attending the University of Ottawa (N=34), Carleton University (N=28), Queen's (N=14) and McGill (N=5), and

(2) First-year students at the University of Ottawa with immersion plus bilingual high school backgrounds, including the OBE/ CBE group described above (N=34) and a group of similar students from other parts of the country (N=22)**.

The OBE/CBE sample is of particular interest, as it includes a group of early immersion (EI) students (N=33) from the Kindergarten 1971 cohort whose progress in French has been traced by the Bilingual Education Project, OISE for some 15 years (Swain and Lapkin 1982) and a group of late immersion (LI) students (N=48) whose progress has been traced by the OBE-RC for 9 years (Morrison and Pawley 1986)

---

* The subjects included in this study are those for whom information on all measures was obtained (approximately 79% of those identified)

** The breakdown of the sample by province is as follows : Ontario 6, Quebec 5 (Montreal 3, Hull 2) Saskatchewan 3, British Columbia, Alberta, New Brunswick 2 each, Manitoba and New foundland 1 each.

Table 1 provides information on the OBE/CBE sample. It should be noted that the French credits and instruction times indicated reflect the experience of the average student and should be considered only as guidelines.

TABLE 1 : Early and Late Immersion Programs, OBE/CBE

Immersion Program	N	High-school French credits	Cumulative hours of French instruction
Early-entry (EI)	33	10-12 (average)	6500-7000
Late-entry (LI)	48	10-12 (average)	3000-4000

TRACING AND TESTING PROCEDURES

Tracing and testing procedures for the pilot study included those used in the spring of 1985 when the students were still in secondary school and a second set used in the fall and winter of 1985 to locate the target subjects at the four universities of interest for further data gathering.

Secondary Schools

The tracing procedures which had been followed by the OBE-RC for many years greatly facilitated the locating of appropriate students for this study and ensured that they were correctly assigned to analysis groups. The 1985 graduates coming from either the OBE or CBE were members of the K-71 cohort.

March 1985 testing sessions using the pilot tests (described below) were set up at each bilingual high school in the two boards for students drawn from existing school lists. Although 50 per cent of the total group was tested, attendance at any one school ranged from 20 to 83 per cent, probably because of imminent school exams and the fact that many of the students were not taking French that year.

In May of 1985, when most of these students were in grade 13, a questionnaire was circulated to early- or late-immersion students who had completed the OBE or CBE high school bilingual program. Although the primary intent was to obtain two addresses through which the student could likely be reached for several years, and to discover the anticipated post-secondary institution (if any), other questions were posed. These included a self-assessment of the students' French proficiency in the various skill areas, the role they expected French to play in their lives over the next few years, the role they believed the universities should take with respect to opportunities for French language development, and the reasons for their choice of a post-secondary institution.

Because of particular circumstances that year, the means of distribution and collection of the questionnaires was two-phased, including meetings with some 55% of the target population in their grade 13 classes (McGillivray 1986). Follow-up by mail and telephone resulted in a final questionnaire completion rate of

83 per cent. A Master List of all these graduating immersion students was then prepared, including name, address, telephone number, immersion background and anticipated post-secondary institution.

University of Ottawa

In the fall of 1985 every possible effort was made to identify immersion students who were registering for their first year of study at the University of Ottawa. Researchers were present throughout registration at the French proficiency testing sessions for all new students. They asked each registrant with French immersion background to fill out a one-page survey about the types of programs followed (Appendix A) and to give two addresses and a local telephone number. Students who reported early or late immersion plus bilingual high school were subsequently contacted for their consent to take part in the study. The names of any students on the OBE-RC Master List who had indicated University of Ottawa as a preference and who had not been identified at registration were checked against the Univesity's computerized student records, resulting in the location of further subjects.

To improve the tracing procedures in subsequent years, the University of Ottawa's Office of Admissions has agreed to include a questionnaire along with its offer of admission so that all students who decide to register will provide information on previous French immersion experience. This method is less labour intensive and should ensure that relevant students will not be

missed in any future study at the University of Ottawa. (The new instrument, jointly designed by the CSLL and the Institutional Planning Office, is described on page 20 and appears in Appendix B).

During the fall of 1985 the project was expanded to include OBE/CBE immersion plus-bilingual high school graduates attending Carleton, McGill and Queen's universities. The OBE-RC 1985 Master List was used in locating these students by telephone.

All Ottawa students who had not taken the **French Proficiency Tests** in the spring of 1985 were contacted and asked to take them during the fall term in return for a $10 honorarium. All students were asked to fill out the **Self-Assessment** and **Language Use Questionnaire** and return them at the testing sessions or by mail. The initial testing sessions for students living in Ottawa were organized for mid-November and were either in the late afternoon during the week or on Saturday morning at the University of Ottawa. Students seemed reluctant to participate, citing other commitments (e.g. mid-term exams, essays) and of those who did agree, many did not keep their appointments. On the other hand, student response and the attendance rate were much better for a session organized for mid-January, with the help of a telephone reminder of the appointment the evening prior to testing.

Students from the two out-of-town universities were contacted at home during the Christmas holidays and arrangements were made to test as many as possible before they returned to school. An increased honorarium of $20 was offered in order to provide added incentive. Fourteen students attended the session on January 3, 1986.

The tracing and testing procedures require close co-operation among researchers and personnel at the school boards and universities. Testing students while they are still in grade 13 has some advantages although obviously some students will be missed and some will be tested whose results are not of particular interest to the researchers. Testing during first-year university requires much care in the location of subjects, especially those attending out-of-town universities. For in-town students, October and mid-January appear to be the best times, while the only possible time for out-of-town students is during the Christmas vacation.

INSTRUMENTS : PILOT BATTERY

Two sets of instruments were used in the pilot study: one designed to measure French language proficiency, and the other to gather information on French language use patterns and related attitudes. In addition, data relating to institutions were collected through interviews with appropriate persons in administrative positions and in French-language teaching programs and from available documentation.

French Proficiency Tests

The initial French Proficiency Battery was developed out of material from several sources, some of which had been used by the CSLL or the OBE-RC in previous research with secondary school or university level students at advanced proficiency levels in French as a second language. These sources included the CSLL's French proficiency item bank, material adapted by the OBE-RC from retired secondary leaving exams of the Ministry of Education of Quebec for Francophones, the Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool (OAIP) for French as the First Language, and a speaking test developed by the OBE-RC specifically for its research with advanced level immersion students. Separate scores for each subtest as well as an overall written test score were used in the study. A brief description of the original battery is presented in Table 2, and intercorrelations among subtests are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 2 : Pilot French Proficiency Tests

Subtests	Administration Time	Number of Items	Maximum possible score	Source, tasks
Group Test				
Listening Comprehension*	20 minutes	14 (4 multiple choice responses)	14	CSLL French Proficiency Item Bank (Radio Broadcast) Texts and Questions
Reading Comprehension	35 minutes	19 (5 multiple choice responses)	19	Test de rendement en Francais, Level IV Quebec Ministry of Education. Passages and questions
Vocabulary in Context	10 minutes	21 (5 multiple choice responses)	21	O.A.I.P. for Grade 12 Francophones. Identification of correct word meaning in context
Cloze (open)*	20 minutes	35	35	CSLL French Proficiency Item Bank (Journalistic essay) Fill-in format
Total	85 minutes	79 items	79	
Individual Test				
Speaking Test*	15 minutes	3 tasks (each rated on a scale of 1-5 using half point increments)**	15	OBE-RC, for Grade 12 Anglophones in Bilingual Programmes. Face-to-face Interview

* Same as in Revised Battery
** Guidelines given in Appendix C

TABLE 3 : Correlations* Between French Proficiency and Self-Assessment Variables

VARIABLES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. LISTENING	-							
2. READING	.65	-						
3. CLOZE	.54	.56	-					
4. TOTAL WRITTEN** PROFICIENCY	.84	.88	.64	-				
5. TOTAL SPEAKING	.39	N.S.	.40	.35	-			
6. SELF-ASSESSMENT READING	.33	.24	.36	.36	.41	-		
7. SELF-ASSESSMENT LISTENING	.36	.22	.43	.36	.54	.76	-	
8. SELF-ASSESSMENT TOTAL	.35	.28	.48	.38	.45	.89	.91	-

*N = 55 when Speaking score is one of the variables being correlated

N = 107 to 112 when correlation is between other variables

** This includes the Vocabulary in Context subtest

Self-Assessment Questionnaire

The self-administered questionnaire used in the pilot study was developed by R. LeBlanc and his colleagues for use as a placement test for courses in French as a second language by the CSLL at the University of Ottawa (LeBlanc and Painchaud, 1985). It consists of 60 statements about daily life listening and reading activities in French, e.g.

"Over the phone I can understand some basic information in French, such as the name of the caller and the number where he can be reached."

or

"I can read an editorial in French and determine the areas of agreement and disagreement between the authors' views and mine".

The examinee responds to each item on a 5-point scale, from "never" to "always", then calculates his or her score (ranging from 60 to 300 points). Administration time is approximately 20 minutes. This **Self-Assessment** can be interpreted both as a measure of student proficiency in reading and listening skills and as an indication of self-confidence in using French. Separate scores for listening (36 items) and reading (24 items), as well as overall scores, were used in the study. Correlations between subtests and correlations with the French Proficiency Battery are given in Table 3. Correlations with other self-report variables (described below) are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4 : Correlations Between Anxiety and Other Self Report Measures

MEASURE	r
SELF-ASSESSMENT TOTAL	.64
SELF-ASSESSMENT LISTENING	.63
SELF-ASSESSMENT READING	.50
FREQUENCY IN USING FRENCH	.51
DESIRE TO USE FRENCH	.44
REASONS FOR LEARNING FRENCH	.26
FRENCH TV HOURS/ MONTH	N.S.
OTHER HOURS/MONTH	.16
BOOKS/MONTH	.28
MOVIES/MONTH	.17
FRENCH COURSES	.21

N=107-112

From the latter correlations, it is apparent that there is only modest common variance between self-evaluated and objective measures of French proficiency in this battery, with the highest correlation (.48) between the **Self-Assessment** Total and the Cloze Test. A clue to the difference in what is measured by the French Proficiency **Tests** and the French **Self-Assessment** is found, in Table 4, in the substantial correlations between **Self-Assessment** scores and **Anxiety in Using French** showing a relationship between

low Anxiety and high self-evaluation. (The correlations between Anxiety and the written French Proficiency Test or with the Speaking Test are all less than .30 except for the Cloze (.39)).

French Language Use Questionnaire, 1985

This questionnaire was drawn from a number of sources and contains much new material as well. It provides self-report measures of anxiety/self confidence when speaking French; current habitual use of French, at work, socially, shopping, studying and at home; personal reasons for learning French, changes in the amount and type of activities using French between the last year of high school and the first year of university , and current university course work in French. The sources included the Second Language Anxiety Scale from the University of Western Ontario Language Research Group (Clément et al. 1978), and the language use questionnaires developed for the Modern Language Centre, OISE for OBE-RC research with Grade 12 and 13 immersion students in 1984 (McGillivray and Pawley 1985), and for the University of Ottawa's subject-matter language teaching program (Edwards et al. 1984). In addition to adapting items from these sources, the researchers also added a number of new questions. The scales used in the questionnaire are described below.

Anxiety in Using French is based on a series of 10 questions in which the student indicates how nervous, anxious or confident (s)he would be in a given situation requiring the use of French using a 1-4 scale. For example:

I would be nervous if I had to speak French to a salesclerk

A higher score indicates less anxiety and the maximum possible is 40.

The **Desire to Use French** scale includes 9 questions marked on a scale of 1-3 to indicate intensity of motivation. For example :

If I had the opportunity to speak French in a store, I would :

( ) never speak it
( ) speak it occasionally using English whenever possible
( ) speak French most of the time, using English if necessary

The maximum possible is 27 points and a high score indicates a high level of desire to use French.

The **Reasons for Learning French** scale is made up of the following five reasons:

1. Learning French will help me to improve my job possibilities.
2. Knowing French will make it easier for me to travel in French speaking areas.
3. It is interesting to know more than one language.
4. In Canada, people who know the two official languages can contribute to national unity.
5. Knowing the French language makes it easier to get to know people who are French speaking.

Students indicate how important each reason is to them on a scale of 1 to 4, with a maximum possible score of 20. A score of 15

would indicate that on the average, the reasons are moderately important to the student.

The **Frequency of French Use** scale is based on a series of five situations such as:

"Talking with Francophones in the community",

or

"At University between classes or at lunch",

to which students respond by indicating on a 1-4 scale the frequency of their use of French for each one. The maximum score is 20 and a score of 10 indicates that a student uses French <u>sometimes</u> in a variety of situations.

Change in Pattern of Use is a measure designed to show differences in the use of French between the last year of secondary school and this year in three broad areas, at school, at work, and socially. The maximum score possible is 9, using a 3 point scale, and a score of 6 indicates that a student uses French this year about the same amount as last year.

Future Use is a measure of the student's future intention to use French in the same general areas as the previous scale (work, university, socially). It also uses a 3 point scale with a maximum score of 9. A score of 6 indicates that the student will use French in the future about the same as now.

University of Ottawa Tracing Questionnaire

In the course of the pilot project, a joint questionnaire for entering students was prepared with the Institutional Planning Office (IPO) of the University of Ottawa (Appendix B), based partially on the one used by this project in 1985 to locate former immersion students at the University. The IPO Questionnaire includes a series of questions on core and immersion French background, allowing different sub-groups of the population to be identified, and on the student's intention to pursue French study at the university. This questionnaire was distributed by mail to all entering students in 1986. Some preliminary findings on the post-immersion population are reported in Chapter V.

Revision of Instruments

Following the testing of the students in this study, the entire battery of instruments was reanalysed and further revised, in light of the appropriateness of particular items or sections for the post-secondary French immersion population. The changes made are described in Chapter IV.

III. 1985 FRENCH IMMERSION GRADUATES : DESCRIPTION

The sample studied consists of 81 graduates of early or late immersion plus bilingual high school in the Ottawa-Carleton region, and of a group of 22 similar students from other parts of Canada entering the University of Ottawa in 1985. The following baseline description is based on data from the pilot test battery described in Chapter II, including measures of French proficiency and French language use patterns and attitudes. Special attention is paid to characteristics of the total OBE/CBE sample, to early immersion (N=33) contrasted with late immersion (N=48) subgroups of this sample, to the subgroups attending Carleton University (N=28) and the University of Ottawa (N=34) and to the subgroups, OBE/CBE (N=34) and Out-of-town (N=22), at the University of Ottawa.

The only institutional comparisons are those between Carleton University and the University of Ottawa. It was felt that any differences between Queen's and Ottawa students would probably be due to other factors than sociolinguistic setting.and there were not enough McGill students to analyze separately. The contrast between Ottawa's English and bilingual universities, however, provides a test of the influence of sociolinguistic factors on choice of institution by students from similar backgrounds. Thus it might be expected that students with higher levels of French proficiency would be more likely to choose the bilingual university than those with lower proficiency, other

factors being equal. (Of course, other factors are never equal, and only general group tendencies would be expected to emerge).

The Out-of-town group is not contrasted with the overall OBE/CBE sample since it was felt that results would be difficult to interpret, whereas in the University at Ottawa contrasts for OBE/CBE and Out-of-town samples the sociolinguistic and academic environment variables are constant.

Results are presented in three sections: French language proficiency, self-assessment of French proficiency and language use patterns and attitudes.

FRENCH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Descriptive statistics on the written French Proficiency Test scores of the various subgroups and of the total OBE/CBE sample of 81 students are given in Table 5.

TABLE 5 : French Proficiency Written Test : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples

POPULATION	N	LISTENING (max=14) M	LISTENING (max=14) SD	READING (max=19) M	READING (max=19) SD	VOCABULARY (max=23) M	VOCABULARY (max=23) SD	CLOZE (max=35) M	CLOZE (max=35) SD	TOTAL (max=91) M	TOTAL (max=91) SD
TOTAL OBE/CBE SAMPLE	81	10.0	2.3	13.0	3.0	15.5	3.6	26.5	5.2	65.4	10.2
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY INSTITUTION											
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	34	9.8	2.1	12.3	3.1	17.0	6.2	25.2	4.8	63.3	9.6
CARLETON UNIVERSITY	28	9.7	2.8	12.9	2.9	15.1	4.0	26.6	5.9	64.8	11.4
QUEEN'S	14	10.7	1.9	14.1	2.7	14.5	4.9	27.6	4.8	68.8	9.4
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY IMMERSION PROGRAM											
EARLY PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	33	10.8	2.0	13.1	2.6	15.4	4.0	26.7	5.0	66.4	9.4
LATE PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	48	9.5	2.3	13.0	3.2	15.6	3.4	26.4	5.3	64.7	10.7
OUT-OF-TOWN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	22	10.5	2.8	11.7	3.9	14.7	4.0	23.9	8.5	60.8	17.5

The average total score of 65.4 (or approximately 72 per cent correct) obtained by the OBE/CBE sample on this difficult test indicates a high level of listening, reading and writing skills for this relatively select group, which had completed grade 13. The individual subtests were similar in difficulty, with mean scores ranging from 68 per cent correct on the **Reading** subtest to 76 per cent on the **Cloze** subtest. The mean score of 13 on the **Reading** subtest is equivalent to a percentile rank of about 60 for the total norm group of Francophone students in the province of Quebec which took this test at the end of secondary school (grade 11). No norms were available for university-bound Fracophone students.

Table 6 presents descriptive statistics for the **Speaking Test**. The average of 11.1 out of a possible 15 points again reflects a high level of functional capability. However, the range of vocabulary and the level of accuracy is well below native speaker performance. The mean ratings on individual parts of the **Speaking Test** ranges from 3.6 to 3.8 for the total OBE/CBE sample. Reference to the descriptions of the levels of speaking performance rated at 3 and 4 provide an indication of the oral production capabilities of this group (Appendix C).

Table 6 shows descriptive statistics for the Speaking Test.

TABLE 6 : French Proficiency Speaking Test : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples

POPULATION	N	SPEAKING PART 1 (max=5) M	SD	PART 2 (max=5) M	SD	PART 3 (max=5) M	SD	TOTAL (max=15) M	SD
TOTAL CBE/OBE SAMPLE	58	3.6	.68	3.7	.69	3.8	.68	11.1	2.1
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY INSTITUTION									
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	34	3.7	.58	3.9	.64	3.9	.58	11.7	1.9
CARLETON UNIVERSITY	17	3.3	.69	3.4	.68	3.6	.78	10.1	2.1
QUEEN'S	10	3.5	.88	3.5	.71	3.7	.79	10.7	2.3
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY IMMERSION PROGRAM									
EARLY PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	23	3.8	.60	3.9	.60	4.1	.48	11.7	1.6
LATE PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	35	3.4	.70	3.5	.71	3.6	.73	10.6	2.2
OUT OF TOWN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	NOT TESTED								

The results of ANOVAs reported in Tables 7 and 8 show the statistical significance of score differences on the various proficiency and speaking subtests between early (EI) and late immersion (LI) students from the OBE/CBE sample. Tables 9 and 10 show similar data for subsamples from Carleton University and the University of Ottawa, while the data in Table 11 provide comparisons of results on the proficiency tests for the two subsamples at the University of Ottawa.

EI versus LI :

Tables 7 and 8 show significant differences favoring the early (EI) over the late (LI) OBE/CBE samples on the **Listening** subtest and all **Speaking** tasks. There are no significant differences on the **Reading**, **Vocabulary** or **Cloze** subtests, however, nor on the total written **French Proficiency Test** score.

TABLE 7 : French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN		MEAN SQUARES	F
	EARLY	LATE		
LISTENING	10.8	9.5	31.8	6.5 **
READING	13.1	13.0	.2	.0
VOCABULARY	15.4	15.6	1.2	.1
CLOZE	26.7	26.4	1.8	.1
TOTAL	66.4	64.7	55.3	.5

** $p < .01$

TABLE 8 : French Proficiency Speaking Test : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN EARLY	MEAN LATE	MEAN SQUARES	F
SPEAKING-1	3.8	3.4	2.0	4.5 *
SPEAKING-2	3.9	3.5	2.0	4.4 *
SPEAKING-3	4.1	3.6	3.0	7.3 **
SPEAKING TOTAL	11.7	10.6	16.7	4.2 *

* p < .05 ** p < .01

Institutional Differences

The **Speaking Test** reveals differences between the Carleton and University of Ottawa students in favour of the latter on two tasks and overall (Table 10). There are no other significant differences between these two groups on proficiency measures.

TABLE 9: French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN CARLETON	MEAN OTTAWA	MEAN SQUARES	F
LISTENING	9.7	9.8	.1	.0
READING	12.9	12.3	6.4	.7
VOCABULARY	15.1	17.0	13.9	1.3
CLOZE	26.6	25.2	25.9	.9
TOTAL	64.8	63.3	35.3	.3

TABLE 10: French Proficiency Speaking Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN CARLETON	MEAN OTTAWA	MEAN SQUARES	F
SPEAKING-1	3.3	3.7	2.4	6.4 *
SPEAKING-2	3.4	3.9	2.8	6.5 *
SPEAKING-3	3.6	3.9	1.1	2.6
SPEAKING TOTAL	10.1	11.7	24.8	6.5 *

* P < .05

Local and Out-of-town Students : University of Ottawa

The Out-of-town students at the University of Ottawa were not given the **Speaking Test.** ANOVA did not reveal any significant differences between this group and the OBE/CBE sample at the University of Ottawa on any of the written measures (Table 11).

TABLE 11 : French Proficiency Written Test : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN OBE/CBE	MEAN OUT/TOWN	MEAN SQUARES	F
LISTENING	9.8	10.5	6.7	1.2
READING	12.3	11.7	4.2	.4
VOCABULARY	17.0	14.7	54.9	1.8
CLOZE	25.2	23.9	11.5	.3
TOTAL	63.3	60.8	6.3	.0

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF FRENCH PROFICIENCY

Descriptive statistics on French Self-Assessment scores for listening and reading skills are presented in Table 12 for the various samples:

The average score of 268.4 of a possible 300 points (or 89%) on this evaluation of receptive skills indicates a high degree of confidence among OBE/CBE students with respect to their ability to carry out functional listening and reading tasks in French in an academic environment. The Out-of-town sample is not far behind at 258.6.

TABLE 12 : Self-Assessment Measures : Descriptive Statistics, Total Sample and Subsamples

POPULATION	N	SELF-ASSESSMENT* LISTENING M	SD	SELF-ASSESSMENT* READING M	SD	SELF-ASSESSMENT* TOTAL M	SD
TOTAL OBE/CBE SAMPLE	81	163.2	17.5	106.9	13.5	268.4	29.3
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY INSTITUTION							
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	33	166.5	13.0	109.9	11.5	272.2	25.7
CARLETON UNIVERSITY	28	157.3	23.9	102.9	16.6	259.4	37.0
QUEEN'S	14	167.4	11.4	110.3	9.8	277.9	21.3
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY IMMERSION PROGRAM							
EARLY PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	32	169.6	10.2	111.3	13.3	277.8	24.7
LATE PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	49	158.8	20.1	103.8	12.9	262.2	30.7
OUT OF TOWN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	22	159.8	18.5	104.9	15.8	258.6	36.2

* Max Score Listening = 180
Max Score Reading = 120
Max Score Total = 300

EI and LI

ANOVA reveals significant differences between the Self Assessment scores of early versus late immersion students in the OBE/CBE sample on both the Listening and Reading subtests and for total scores as shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13: Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN EARLY	MEAN LATE	MEAN SQUARES	F
SELF-ASSESSMENT LISTENING	169.6	158.8	2188.1	7.7 **
SELF-ASSESSMENT READING	111.3	103.8	1038.7	6.1 *
SELF-ASSESSMENT TOTAL	277.8	262.2	4511.0	5.5 *

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Institutional Differences

Differences in average scores for the OBE/CBE samples attending Carleton and Ottawa universities are not significant at the .05 confidence level, but come close for both the Listening and Reading subtests (at $p < .07$) (Table 14). The average total scores for the two groups are not significantly different, however.

TABLE 14 : Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN CARLETON	MEAN OTTAWA	MEAN SQUARES	F
SELF-ASSESSMENT LISTENING	157.3	166.5	1229.0	3.4 +
SELF-ASSESSMENT READING	102.9	109.9	705.9	3.5 +
SELF-ASSESSMENT TOTAL	259.4	272.2	2380.7	2.4

+ p <.07

Local and Out-of-town Students, University of Ottawa

There are no significant differences on the Self-Assessment of French proficiency between CBE/OBE and Out-of-town immersion samples at the University of Ottawa (Table 15).

TABLE 15 : Self-Assessment Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN OBE/CBE	MEAN OUT/TOWN	MEAN SQUARES	F
SELF-ASSESSMENT LISTENING	166.5	159.8	358.5	1.5
SELF-ASSESSMENT READING	109.9	104.9	206.9	1.2
SELF-ASSESSMENT TOTAL	272.2	258.6	1836.9	2.0

FRENCH LANGUAGE USE PATTERNS AND ATTITUDES

Self-Report Measures

Descriptive statistics on attitudes related to using and learning French, as well as on the frequency of French use are presented in Table 16.

While the samples vary somewhat with respect to Anxiety in Using French, the average scores on **Desire to Use French** appears to be very similar for all samples, although there are substantial individual differences within groups on both measures. Among the **Reasons for Learning French** average scores for each of the five reasons proposed were similar in nearly every case. Average scores indicate relatively low Anxiety and a strong **Desire to Use French** as well as strong multiple Reasons for Learning French.

The **Frequency of French Use** reported is not very high. Overall, in fact, all groups except the two University of Ottawa samples indicate that they use French less, on average, than they did during Grade 13. On the other hand, expected Future Use of French is greater than present use for all samples.

TABLE 16 : Self-Report Measures : Descriptive Statistics, Total Samples and Subsamples

POPULATION	N	ANXIETY * IN USING M	ANXIETY * IN USING SD	DESIRE TO USE M	DESIRE TO USE SD	REASONS FOR LEARNING M	REASONS FOR LEARNING SD	FREQUENCY OF USE M	FREQUENCY OF USE SD	CHANGE IN PATTERN OF USE M	CHANGE IN PATTERN OF USE SD	EXPECTED FUTURE USE M	EXPECTED FUTURE USE SD
TOTAL OBE/CBE SAMPLE	81	29.7	6.0	20.9	2.7	16.4	2.9	10.3	2.5	5.6	1.4	6.5	1.2
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY INSTITUTION													
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	33	29.3	5.0	20.8	2.8	16.3	3.1	10.8	2.8	6.0	1.4	6.6	1.1
CARLETON UNIVERSITY	28	28.4	7.3	20.4	2.7	16.4	3.3	9.9	2.3	5.2	1.4	6.5	1.1
QUEENS	14	32.4	4.7	21.8	2.8	16.8	2.0	9.8	2.3	5.4	1.5	6.1	1.5
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY IMMERSION													
EARLY PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	32	31.2	5.8	21.2	2.8	16.6	3.2	11.1	2.3	5.7	1.4	6.5	1.3
LATE PLUS BILINGUAL	49	28.8	6.0	20.8	2.6	16.3	2.7	9.9	2.5	5.5	1.4	6.5	1.1
OUT OF TOWN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	22	30.1	6.0	21.8	2.7	17.6	1.8	12.0	2.9	7.0	3.0	8.0	1.1

* A higher score indicates less anxiety

EI and LI

Of all the attitude and French use measures reported so far, only **Frequency of Use** is significantly different for early versus late immersion students, with more frequent use reported by the former (Table 17). Reported group differences in **Anxiety in Using French** approach significance ($p < .08$), again suggesting somewhat lower anxiety for the early immersion graduates.

TABLE 17 : Self-Report Measures : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN EARLY	MEAN LATE	MEAN SQUARES	F
ANXIETY IN USING	31.2	28.8	107.8	3.1 +
DESIRE TO USE	21.2	20.8	3.1	.4
REASONS FOR LEARNING	16.6	16.3	2.1	.3
FREQUENCY OF USE	11.1	9.9	28.1	4.6 *
CHANGE IN PATTERN OF USE	5.7	5.5	.3	.2
EXPECTED FUTURE USE	6.5	6.5	.0	.0

* $p < .05$ + $p < .08$

Institutional Differences

Only one significant difference on these measures between University of Ottawa and Carleton students is revealed by ANOVA (Table 18) : the degree of reported change in **Patterns of French Use**. Not surprisingly, Anglophone immersion graduates of OBE/CBE

programs attending the University of Ottawa report greater change than do their peers at Carleton.

TABLE 18 : Self Report Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN CARLETON	MEAN OTTAWA	MEAN SQUARES	F
ANXIETY IN USING	28.4	29.3	13.4	.4
DESIRE TO USE	20.4	20.8	1.6	.2
REASONS FOR LEARNING	16.4	16.3	.1	.0
FREQUENCY OF USE	9.9	10.8	12.0	1.8
CHANGE IN PATTERN OF USE	5.2	6.0	9.4	5.0 *
EXPECTED FUTURE USE	6.5	6.6	.3	.2

* $p < .05$

Local and Out-of-town Students, University of Ottawa

ANOVAs reveal some interesting differences between Ottawa area and Out-of-town immersion graduates attending the University of Ottawa (Table 19). A highly significant difference exists with respect to expected **Future Use of French**, with Out-of-town students reporting higher use expectations. Differences in the intensity of **Reasons for Learning French** and recent **Change in Patterns of Use** approach significance (at $p < .06$), again indicating higher motivation and greater change in use patterns for Out-of-town students.

There is one other difference in the Reasons which is of interest. If separate tabulations are made for each of the five reasons which are represented here as a total score, the reason,

> "In Canada people who know the two official languages can contribute to national unity"

is more important to the group of Out-of-town students attending the University of Ottawa than to any other subgroup. The mean of the total OBE/CBE group is 2.8 and of the Out-of-town group, 3.4. The ANOVA comparing these two groups has a $p < .02$.

TABLE 19 : Self-Report Measures : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance.

VARIABLE	MEAN OBE/CBE	MEAN OUT/TOWN	MEAN SQUARES	F
ANXIETY IN USING	29.3	30.1	11.7	.4
DESIRE TO USE	20.8	21.8	16.8	2.2
REASONS FOR LEARNING	16.3	17.6	25.8	3.7 +
FREQUENCY OF USE	10.8	12.0	21.8	2.7
CHANGE IN PATTERN OF USE	6.0	7.0	17.3	3.6 +
EXPECTED FUTURE USE	6.6	8.0	26.8	21.1 **

** $p < .01$ + $p < .06$

Specific Measures of French Language Use

A number of quantitative measures of current French use were included in the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics on these measures are reported in Table 20. Here it can be seen that for

most of these students, there is relatively little use of French outside of French classes either with the media or otherwise. OBE/CBE students report an average of 2 television hours per month in French, one book read in 3 months, one movie in two months and approximately 4.4 hours per month spent in "other" uses of French. Out-of-town students at the University of Ottawa are the dramatic exception, reporting more television hours watched, books read, and most strikingly, far more other hours per month in French (19.2) than OBE/CBE students in any sample. They also report an average of 1.7 French courses, (ranging from 0 to 3), compared to .5, (with the same range of 0 to 3), for the OBE/CBE average. On the other hand, they report the second lowest estimate of French movies viewed per month (.3, or one in three months) with only the Queen's students lower, at a little over one per year. Clearly this Out-of-town group at the University of Ottawa has certain distinguishing characteristics.

TABLE 20 : Specific Measures of French Language Use : Total Sample and Subsamples

POPULATION	N	TV HOURS/ MONTH M	TV HOURS/ MONTH SD	BOOKS READ/ MONTH M	BOOKS READ/ MONTH SD	MOVIES/ MONTH M	MOVIES/ MONTH SD	OTHER HOURS/ MONTH M	OTHER HOURS/ MONTH SD	FRENCH COURSES M	FRENCH COURSES SD
TOTAL OBE/CBE SAMPLE	81	2.0	3.0	.3	.5	.5	.9	4.4	8.7	.5	.7
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY INSTITUTION											
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	33	2.4	3.1	.3	.6	.4	.8	4.1	8.0	.8	.9
CARLETON UNIVERSITY	28	1.8	2.9	.3	.5	.7	1.2	4.1	8.8	.4	.6
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY	14	3.0	4.6	.1	.4	.1	.4	4.0	8.1	.1	.4
OBE/CBE SAMPLE BY IMMERSION PROGRAM											
EARLY PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	32	1.8	3.0	.4	.7	.6	.9	5.3	9.0	.7	.9
LATE PLUS BILINGUAL HIGH SCHOOL	49	2.1	3.0	.2	.4	.4	.9	3.7	8.5	.4	.6
OUT-OF-TOWN STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	22	3.4	3.6	.5	.7	.3	.6	19.2	34.4	1.7	1.8

EI and LI

While the early immersion students report a higher average in French course enrollment than late immersion (.7 vs .4), and of books read, movies viewed and other hours in French, none of these differences reach statistical significance (Table 21).

TABLE 21: Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Groups for Total OBE/CBE Sample Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN EARLY	MEAN LATE	MEAN SQUARES	F
TV HOURS/MONTH	1.8	2.1	1.7	.2
BOOKS READ/MONTH	.4	.2	.6	2.3
MOVIES/MONTH	.6	.4	.8	1.0
OTHER HOURS/MONTH	5.3	3.7	51.4	.7
FRENCH COURSES	.7	.4	1.5	2.8

Institutional Differences

Only one significant difference on these French use measures is revealed by ANOVA analysis between the University of Ottawa and Carleton samples (Table 22). As might be expected, University of Ottawa students take significantly more French courses (an average of .8 versus .4 for Carleton).

TABLE 22 : Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of OBE/CBE Students at Ottawa and Carleton Universities Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN CARLETON	MEAN OTTAWA	MEAN SQUARES	F
TV HOURS/MONTH	1.8	2.4	5.1	.6
BOOKS READ/MONTH	.3	.3	.0	.0
MOVIES/MONTH	.7	.4	1.0	1.0
OTHER HOURS/MONTH	4.1	4.1	.0	.0
FRENCH COURSES	.4	.8	2.7	4.8 *

* $p < .05$

Local and Out-of-town Students, University of Ottawa

As expected from the descriptive statistics, there are significant differences between Ottawa samples from the OBE/CBE and Out-of-town samples favouring the latter with respect to the other hours per month of French use and the number of French courses taken (Table 23). Both groups report similar activities in other hours per month, the most frequently cited being work, friends and sports activities.

TABLE 23 : Specific Measures of French Language Use : Comparison of OBE/CBE and Out-of-town Samples at the University of Ottawa Using Analysis of Variance

VARIABLE	MEAN OBE/CBE	MEAN OUT/TOWN	MEAN SQUARES	F
TV HOURS/MONTH	2.4	3.4	10.9	1.0
BOOKS READ/MONTH	.3	.5	.5	1.1
MOVIES/MONTH	.4	.3	.0	.0
OTHER HOURS/MONTH	4.1	19.2	2783.5	5.5 *
FRENCH COURSES	.8	1.7	9.4	5.4 *

* $p < .05$

One factor which may account for some of the observed differences is that 5 of the 22 Out-of-town students are participants in the Secretary of State's Bilingual Bursary Program, and are each taking three courses in French. Three of these students also report 20 or more other hours per month while only two non-bursary students report similar averages. Without the five bursary students, the Out-of-town students still have an average of 7.8 other hours per month, well above the average (4.1) of the OBE/CBE group. The average number of French courses drops, however, to a level close to that of the other University of Ottawa students.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, these bilingual high school graduates in first year university studies demonstrated high levels of functional ability in all language skills tested (listening, reading, speaking, vocabulary, and integrated knowledge of the written language). Furthermore, most of them gave high ratings to their functional listening and reading skills, indicating self-confidence about their ability to use their receptive skills in daily life situations. Whether this positive self-perception reflected relatively limited experience in using French with native speakers as well as actual skills is not entirely clear, and is one of the questions which a longitudinal study of this population should resolve.

The students are also characterized by a relatively low level of (self-perceived) anxiety when they use French, and report a strong desire to use and to continue learning French. The latter appears to be motivated by a number of different reasons. On the other hand, the actual frequency with which these first-year university students actually use French is quite low, either in their studies or in leisure or other pursuits.

There are some notable differences among the subsamples of students compared in this study, as summarized below:

EI and LI

Early immersion students perform significantly better than late immersion students on **Listening** and **Speaking** tests, although there are no significant differences on any written measures. Early immersion students also rate themselves significantly higher on functional listening and reading skills, probably related to their somewhat lower self-reported levels of **Anxiety in Using French**. They also report significantly more frequent use of French, although none of the specific measures of French use show a difference for the two groups. Thus while the EI students in this sample appear to have some advantage in terms of self-confidence in their second language, face-to-face French skills and ongoing practice of French, the differences are not large, and LI students do not appear to be significantly different with respect to those French skills most related to the academic environment.

Institutional Differences

There are a few significant differences in the subsamples attending Ottawa's bilingual University of Ottawa and English language Carleton University, but again they are relatively minor. The University of Ottawa students perform better on the **Speaking Test**; otherwise measured French proficiency is not significantly different. The University of Ottawa students also assess themselves as being slightly better in functional listening and speaking skills. The two groups differ most in their current use of French, so that University of Ottawa

students report a greater degree of **Change in Patterns of French Use**, and, specifically, they take more courses in French. Again, while the University entry level differences are minimal between these two subsamples, a longitudinal study through the university years might be expected to reveal an increasing gap between them in French proficiency and use patterns because of the difference in opportunities to use French.

University of Ottawa Subsamples

The Ottawa area graduates and Out-of-town students at the University of Ottawa were not significantly different on the **French Proficiency Tests** or **Self-Assessment**. They also share similar attitudinal characteristics, with one interesting exception: the Out-of-town students are significantly more likely to give greater weight to the importance of bilingualism for national unity as one of their reasons for learning French. The latter students also report much more frequent French use than do the OBE/CBE students, both in and out of class. Their greater average number of French courses may largely be attributed to participation of 5 of the 22 students in the Bilingual Bursary Program of the Secretary of State, for which they take 3 courses per term in French. However, the 17 Out-of-town students not in the bursary program still report a far greater number of hours of "other" kinds of French use than do the OBE/CBE graduates. These findings suggest that the University of Ottawa attracts an identifiable group of functionally bilingual Anglophone students from other parts of Canada at least partly because of its bilingual context and offerings in French.

IV. INSTRUMENTS : REVISED BATTERY

FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS

The revised **French Proficiency Tests** are briefly described in Table 24. Certain items in the pilot written test which had inappropriate difficulty or discrimination indices were deleted. The second reading passage was replaced with a new one, which was subsequently field-tested for calibration with one of the existing passages in advanced French-as-a-second language classes at the University of Ottawa. The **Vocabulary in Context** subtest was deleted because of the lack of discrimination of many of its items. Descriptive data on the revised battery presented in this report are based on the original data for the material retained, supplemented by a separate item analysis for the proposed new reading text and some normative data available on the proposed **Dictation** (Appendix D).

The **Speaking Test** was not revised, as it provided a valuable overall assessment of oral skills (see Appendix C for the scoring guidelines). Nonetheless, the researchers recognize the need for a more precise instrument which can be used to elicit specific information about students' interlanguage development and which will discriminate better among students at advanced levels of French. It should also be emphasized that the intra- and inter-rater reliablity of the test is to a large extent dependent upon training and experience. In the present study, only one tester was used. At least 10 months after the administration of the

French Speaking Test, 30 of the taped tests were rescored by this tester. A chi square showed no significant differences between the two scorings in the distributions of total scores, or on any of the three part scores. On each part between 93 and 100 per cent of the ratings were exactly the same or within 0.5 of the original rating.

TABLE 24 : Revised French Proficiency Tests

Subtests	Administration Time	Number of Items	Maximum Score	Description of content
Group Test				
Listening Comprehension	20 minutes	14 (4 multiple choice responses)	14	Three excerpts from radio broadcasts dealing with solar heating in ancient times, pollution, and the proliferation of languages
Dictation	10 minutes	113	28	Extract from a psychology textbook on the nature of genius (university level)
Reading	30 minutes	15 (4 or 5 multiple choice responses)	15	Three readings dealing with the benefits of exploration of space, bilingualism in the U.S., and the French language
Cloze (Open)	20 minutes	35	35	Extract from a journalistic essay on the proliferation of Gallup-type polls
Total	85 minutes			
Individual Test				
Speaking Test	15 minutes	3 tasks	15	Tasks are based partly on traditional materials (e.g. series of related pictures which the examinee is asked to describe) and include a simulated discussion and job interview based on authentic texts (e.g. brochures from two locales).

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The **Pilot Self-Assessment** showed a strong ceiling effect for this sample. In its revised form, 28 of the easier items (for which most of these students rated themselves 5) have been deleted. Twelve more difficult items (5 in Listening and Speaking, 7 in Reading and Writing), reflecting a more varied sociolinguistic environment, have been added - for example:

> No matter what the topic, I seldom need to ask for appropriate vocabulary in French in order to express myself fluently.

or

> There is no difference in my reading speed whether the text is in French or in my native language.

The test now comprises 20 items related to **Listening and Speaking** and 20 items related to **Reading and Writing**. It has not been field-tested in its revised form, but has been read and edited by a number of language teachers and researchers.

FRENCH LANGUAGE USE QUESTIONNAIRE

The major revision to this questionnaire (Appendix E) was the addition of items to determine more precisely the respondents' major field of study and the type and duration of French courses followed as part of their university studies.

APPLICABILITY OF TEST BATTERY FOR OTHER STUDIES

In our view, the revised battery can readily be used in other studies of similar populations elsewhere in Canada. It will be made available by the researchers upon request.* In its current form, the battery provides valid, reliable and relatively comprehensive measures of French proficiency in listening, reading, and speaking. As well, the dictation and cloze tests measure some writing skills. They also use procedures which tend to be highly correlated with more global writing tasks, although they do not test the higher level discourse skills. All tests are geared in subject matter and difficulty level for a university student population with immersion background, and are sufficiently difficult to reflect progress from the first year level through university graduation.

The Self-Assessment questionnaire, as revised, should no longer show a ceiling effect for this population, and can be considered a useful measure of self-confidence as well as of receptive proficiency in using French, both for gathering baseline data and for a longitudinal study. A major advantage is its administrative convenience, since it can be self-administered. Thus it is an appropriate instrument, along with other self-report measures, for mail-out administration.

---

* For information on the written French Proficiency Test, the Self-Assessment and the Language Use Questionnaire, contact Dr.M.Wesche, Centre for Second Language Learning, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5. For information on the Speaking Test, contact Dr.F.Morrison or Mrs.C.Pawley, Ottawa Board of Education Research Centre, 330 Gilmour Street, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2P 0P9.

The **French Language Use Questionnaire** coupled with the IPO (University of Ottawa) admission questionnaire provide a comprehensive survey of most aspects of French use relevant to the university context, and again should be appropriate for other studies in university contexts.

While the Revised Battery should serve well for the tracing of general French proficiency and language use patterns, it does not attempt to elicit particular aspects of learner interlanguage either in speech or writing, as would be of interest for language acquisition research. Nor does it attempt to look diagnostically at shortcomings in learner language with a view to development of appropriate French language programs for these students.

Thus the priorities for supplementary instrument development as seen by these researchers and others with whom they have consulted* would include:

1. an oral test designed to elicit particular grammatical constructions, discourse and sociolinguistic features,

2. a written composition test which will reflect the students' ability to organize information at the discourse level and to write with stylistic features, vocabulary and accuracy appropriate to academic assignments.

---

* A meeting was held March 3, 1986 with Dr.Sharon Lapkin and Dr.Birgit Harley in which this issue was discussed along with the proposed revisions of the French Proficiency Battery.

V. SURVEY OF POST-SECONDARY OPPORTUNITIES IN FRENCH FOR IMMERSION GRADUATES

The four universities which traditionally attract the majority of high school graduates from the Ottawa-Carleton area, Carleton, McGill, Queen's and Ottawa, were surveyed regarding the current status of their French language offerings and any plans for accommodating incoming immersion graduates. At the present time, all four provide undergraduate courses or programs in French as a second language, in translation and in French language and literature. Administrators in each of the universities are aware of the possible French language needs of these students and are actively considering the development of long-term strategies. Because of the unique nature of each institution, their other responses have varied considerably and will be described separately.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

In order to provide students with a cohesive overview of policy and the programs available with regard to French language use on campus, Carleton University has prepared a brochure entitled "French at Carleton University", first printed in 1984. In it, the university emphasizes that it encourages all students, regardless of their course of study, to improve their fluency in French. This is considered so essential in journalism and Canadian studies that the study of French forms an integral part of these programs. In keeping with its stated policy, Carleton

also encourages departments to allow those who prefer to use French as the language of essays and examinations to do so both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Coupled with this outline of policy, the brochure goes on to describe the French courses available in the traditional areas of French study for students at all levels of proficiency and to provide information about other non-academic resources and activities (e.g. le club Francophone). It seems to be a useful guide to students both on a practical level and for its enunciation of an important aspect of university policy.

The Office of the Vice-President (Planning and Development) reports that the university may implement a policy of providing recognition for students with strong French language skills who are willing to do some of their course work in French by including a "mention francaise" on the diplomas of qualified graduates. Such a distinction would be awarded to students who have a good command of the French language, who take a second year course "Francophonie au Canada" and who during their third and fourth year work in some specified way with materials in French related to their course of study. A program such as this would offer a challenge to interested students and recognition of their efforts in the context of French as a second language.

Carleton is also considering a policy of tracking incoming immersion students in order to respond more specifically to their needs.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY

McGill officials report that their University is still in the process of studying the problem. They have set up an ad-hoc committee to study and rationalize second language teaching with a view to accommodating the needs of French immersion graduates. Thus far no steps other than those outlined in the opening paragraph have been taken officially.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

Queen's was singled out in the Commissioner of Official Languages 1985 report on the state of bilingualism for its efforts in promoting the use of French at the post-secondary level. As early as 1975, Queen's instituted two non-academic measures to promote the use of French on campus. These were the introduction of French Floors in the residences and the French Table, a once-a-week evening meal served in a residence dining room where the conversation is in French only. In 1981, a French Centre was added which offers a number of non-credit French courses, social activities, concerts, films, lectures and informal Drop-In periods.

The first bilingualism co-ordinator, Dr.Max Vernet, was appointed in 1983 to implement a 1981 University Council decision that Queen's should initiate a formal teaching program in French to complement what was already in place. In spite of the disappointing results of a 1984 survey distributed to high school students in which students were asked to indicate which of a

list of possible courses to be offered in French interested them, Professor Vernet's successor, Dr.Suzanne Fortier of the Chemistry Department, has continued efforts to implement academic courses in French.

In the Fall of both 1984 and 1985, students were offered the opportunity of taking courses conducted entirely in French or of taking courses which provided either a tutorial or lab section in French. The response by students in both years was disappointing. Of the eight courses advertised (first year chemistry, economics, music, and mathematics - plus those with only the tutorials or lab sections in French - classical studies, political studies, geology and physics) only two were given in 1984 : classical studies and political studies. Of the six courses offered the following year with tutorial or lab sessions in French, (first year chemistry, economics, classical studies, political studies, history and sociology), four were given: chemistry, classical studies, political studies and sociology. None of the tutorial groups was very large (7-12 students per group), but the professors and students involved in the program were enthusiastic.

In spite of the limited response shown so far, Queen's intends to continue offering a selection of courses with tutorial or lab sections in French to incoming students. If interest were to increase dramatically, the University would be prepared to expand this program to meet the demand.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

The University of Ottawa is in the unique position of being a bilingual university. All of the courses and degree programs offered to Francophones are also open to Anglophones with adequate French proficiency, and as part of the University's official policy, students may choose to write assignments and exams in either French or English.

Traditionally, the majority of students take most or all of their courses in their first language, taking only those second language courses which are essential to fulfill the University's second language requirement. This requirement varies in the different faculties, but may mean as many as four semesters of second language study for students who are beginners when they enter. To date, almost all graduates of OBE/CBE bilingual high school programs have easily met the requirement upon entry by passing the university's Test de Competence en francais.

In an effort to encourage students to try subject matter courses in their second language, the University's Centre for Second Language Learning and the School of Psychology began an experimental program in 1982. Its purpose was to encourage students who had the advanced intermediate second language skills but who lacked the confidence to take a regular course in their second language geared to native speakers. Two Introductory Psychology sections limited to second language speakers were set up - one for Anglophones in French and one for Francophones in

English. Except for a 15 minute session with a language teacher during each 90 minute lecture period, the professor, format and course material were the same as that in the classes for first language students. The primary role of the language teacher was not to teach language but to ensure that students understood the lecture material and their reading assignments.

The initial experience at the University of Ottawa was similar to that at Queen's in that relatively few students registered for the courses, and active recruiting was necessary. As at Queen's, those who participated were enthusiastic and successful, improving their second language skills while learning the subject matter (Edwards et al 1984, Wesche 1985). The CSLL with the collaboration of interested departments has continued to offer a slowly growing number of special courses for second language speakers, with an emphasis on courses in French for Anglophones (see Table 25). Financial constraints forced a change in format, so that students in these courses currently have regular lecture sections with Francophone students, supplemented by an adjunct French second language class and in some cases a sheltered discussion section. In 1985-86 and 1986-87, first year psychology, sociology, history and linguistics courses were offered. Several other departments have expressed an interest for 1987-88. Recruitment remains the most important problem associated with the program.

TABLE 25 : Sheltered and Adjunct Courses in French for Anglophones (Subject-Matter Language Teaching)

Year	Courses	Credits	No. of Students	
1981-82 (pilot)	psychology	3	30	
1982-83	psychology	3	32	
1983-84	psychology	6	32	
1984-85	psychology	6	17	40
	history	6	8	
	sociology	6	7	
	linguistics	3	8	
1985-86	psychology	6	12	51
	history	6	18	
	sociology	6	8	
	linguistics	3	13	

1985 - 1986 : The University of Ottawa's experience to date with immersion students has been similar. Although theoretically many of them have sufficient fluency upon university entry to be able to do some of their course work in French with Francophone students, they tend not to do so. Of the 78 students in this pilot study at the University, 24 students (31%) took no French courses at all during their first year. The average number of French courses* taken by these students at the University of

* French courses, as used here, include courses in French as a second language, as well as literature courses and subject matter courses in French for Anglophones and Francophones.

Ottawa was 0.8, which, while significantly higher than the average for students at the other universities, was low considering the opportunities available.

The 54 students who took French included 12 who were required by their Faculties to take a French language course. The remaining 42 chose courses from a wide range of subject areas. Of the 70 courses above the second language requirement, only 22 were in traditional French-language programs. The other subject areas chosen, in order of frequency, were biology (16), history (7), political science (6), engineering (6), economics (5), administration (3), mathematics (3) and philosophy and common law with (1) course each.

Comments made by students on the French Language Use Questionnaire provide an indication of why students are not willing to take the majority of their courses in French. Of the 27 students who commented on their present situation, the majority said they would like to take at least one of their university courses in French. For those who were not actually taking any courses in French, the most frequently cited reason was that their course load was too heavy to permit "extra" courses in French. (Students at universities other than Ottawa were more likely to say that there were no suitable courses available or that the selection was too limited). Two students were also worried about what effect taking subject matter courses in French might have on their grade point average.

Students appeared to be very much interested in maintaining and improving their French but were finding that their present priorities could not always accommodate their language aspirations.

1986-87 : The University of Ottawa's new tracing procedures to identify incoming immersion graduates were introduced in 1986-87, as an outgrowth of this study. This will help in future monitoring of numbers. The procedures will also make it possible to ascertain whether, as a group, these students have any special second language needs. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix B, and descriptive data on the results of the initial survey undertaken in 1986-87 are reported below.

The University of Ottawa tracing questionnaire which was sent to candidates in early 1986 with the Offer of Admission was answered by 919 persons. Of these, the University reports that 701 were first year students, of whom 690 gave their mother tongue as English, 58 as French and 171 as a language other than English or French. The total enrollment of first year students was 2,628 of whom 1,464 gave English as their mother tongue, 921 gave French and 243 indicated a language other than French or English. The results of Question 1 in which students were asked to specify their immersion experience are reported in Table 26.

TABLE 26 : Immersion Background of First Year Students at the University of Ottawa (1986-87)

Program	No. of Students *
No French at all	292
Core French (20 minutes per day)	530
Extended French (Core French plus One Subject in French)	111
Early Immersion Only	112
Late Immersion Only	136
Bilingual High School Only	180
School for Francophones	130
Other	165
Early Immersion plus Bilingual High School (full sequence)	65
Late Immersion plus Bilingual High School (full sequence)	37

* This represents the number of students who reported a minimum of one year in a program

Among 1986 entrants, 102 students report a combination of either early or late immersion with bilingual high school as compared to the 56 students we were able to find last year. Of these 73 students are from the Ottawa area and 29 are from out of town.

Students were also asked about their intentions to study in French at University of Ottawa. Of the 893 students who responded to this question, 590 (or 66 per cent) said they would. Of these, 60 students said they intended to take "most" of their courses in

French, 172 said "some" courses in French and 322 said "one or two" courses in French. The remaining 303 students reported that they would not study in French.

Five reasons were offered to students as possible influences on their decision to study in French. The results are reported in Table 27.

TABLE 27 : Survey of Student Reasons for Studying in French in Order of Frequency

Reason	No. of Students
I am interested in the French Language	400
I need to further my French learning	371
I wish to complete my program in both English and French	183
French was recommended to me	54
Most of the courses in my program are taught in French	29

Students also specified other reasons. Twenty said knowledge of French was important to their career; 16 indicated a desire to be bilingual and 16 others, a desire to maintain their French.

Students appear committed to taking courses in French in order to improve or maintain what they have already achieved, mainly because of personal interest rather than external pressure.

The results of the survey of the 303 students who indicated that they would not study in French are reported in Table 28.

TABLE 28 : Survey of Student Reasons for Not Studying in French in Order of Frequency.

Reason	No.of Students
It may be detrimental to my marks	171
I have no interest in pursuing my studies in French at this time	127
I do not need to further my French learning at this time	79
I am fluent enough in French now	56
French was not recommended to me	18
No or too few courses are offered in French	4

In response to an open-ended question, 17 students said that they were not fluent enough to be able to study in French.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the researchers were heartened by the discussions with officials at all four institutions concerning the special characteristics of entering immersion students and plans for meeting their needs. All have shown an interest in discussing the issues. If the demand for subject-matter courses materializes, all of these institutions have declared or demonstrated themselves willing to respond positively within the limits imposed by financial constraints. The problem which is of most concern is that because of other priorities, students themselves may not create sufficient demand to make this a viable option.

VI. PROPOSAL FOR FIRST TWO YEARS OF A SIX YEAR LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF POST-SECONDARY EXPERIENCES OF FRENCH IMMERSION GRADUATES

INTRODUCTION

The study proposed in this section is a two-year continuation of the pilot study as part of a six-year study of post-secondary immersion graduates in Eastern Ontario.

The first large group of early and late immersion graduates in the Ottawa Carleton area (the K-71 cohort) reached university in September, 1985. As reported in the body of the present report, a battery of tests was administered to those at the University of Ottawa and to others attending nearby universities. The data from these instruments have been analyzed and a number of revisions made. As a result, a battery measuring listening, reading and speaking skills, as well as language use patterns and related attitudes, is now available for research in Eastern Ontario and elsewhere with immersion graduates. Furthermore, the pilot project has gathered and described baseline data on the Ottawa area graduates of bilingual high school programs, linking findings to early versus late immersion programs and choice of university.

In order to replicate and extend the results obtained in the pilot year, and to determine the effects of different post-secondary experiences on this population, it is essential for the project to be continued. A two-year extension will permit the retesting of the K-71 cohort three years after their completion

of grade 13, replication of the pilot study, and the gathering of initial data on the K-74 cohort. The latter group will be in grade 13 in 1987-88 and both cohorts can be tested in 1988 using the revised instruments. These two cohorts are particularly important, since much information has been collected on the immersion students who entered kindergarten in 1971 or 1974 and progressed through the various programs offered in the Ottawa region. Ideally, the two-year extension will be followed by a further three-year extension constituting a six-year comprehensive, longitudinal follow-up of two OBE/CBE cohorts. A schematic research plan is given in Table 29.

As in the pilot study, the extension proposed here will describe and update information about French-language offerings for these students in the universities of the region, and will also obtain information about the students' use of French, their French proficiency and their attitudes toward various language-related issues. This longer study is a model which can be replicated in other parts of the country as the numbers of immersion graduates increase. The considerable interest in such studies is apparent from the minutes of the meeting held at OISE in 1985, and the related proposals received at that time from British Columbia, Nova Scotia and other provinces (Modern Language Centre, 1985).

PROPOSED TWO-YEAR STUDY

TABLE 29 : Study of Former French Immersion Students in the Ottawa Area

Time Schedule : 1985 to 1991

	Year of study	F-71 (pilot cohort) plus "Out-of town" Ottawa U. sample	F-72 and F-73	F-74 (second cohort) plus "Out-of-town" Ottawa U. sample
PILOT YEAR (completed October 1986)	Pilot year I (1985-86)	(Pre-test) : Pilot test battery in spring (Gr.13) or fall (first year university). Revision and further development of test instruments	Tracing	Tracing
Proposed 2-year Extension	Year II (1986-87)	Annual follow-up *	Replication : Revised Battery, Try-out of Revised and Supplementary Instruments	Tracing
	Year III (1987-88)	First Post-test : Revised battery in spring (third year university)		Pre-test Revised Battery in spring (Gr.13) or fall (first year university)
Later 3-Year Extension	Year IV (1988-89)	Annual follow-up		Annual follow-up
	Year V (1989-90)			Annual follow-up
	Year VI (1990-91)	(20th anniversary for F-71 cohort) Second Post-Test: Revised battery in spring or fall (after university graduation)		Post-test: Revised Battery in (spring (third year university)

* Annual follow-up includes tracing and archival data-gathering, and may include instrument administration by mail.

Further information on subjects and instruments and the proposed sequence of research activity is given below. The Annual Follow-Up as proposed in Table 29 would consist of archival tracing of university course-work in French by individual students. Information on offerings at University of Ottawa, Carleton, McGill and Queen's Universities would also be updated annually. It might also be decided to administer some or all of the following by mail : **Self-Assessment Questionnaire**, the French **Language Use Questionnaire** and questions on current studies and future plans. The year of study of key groups of subjects is given in Table 30.

TABLE 30: Location of Key OBE/CBE Groups in Successive Academic Years

Group	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91
K-71	Gr.13	Yr.1	Yr.2	Yr.3	Yr.4*	Yr.5*	Yr.6*
K-72		Gr.13	Yr.1				
K-73			Gr.13	Yr.1			
K-74				Gr.13	Yr.1	Yr.2	Yr.3

* after university graduation for many subjects

PURPOSE

The purpose of the six year longitudinal study is to examine the continued progress of the K-71 and K-74 cohorts of former early- and late-entry immersion students from the Ottawa-Carleton area in the first four years after grade 13 with respect to:

a. French language proficiency
b. Language use patterns
c. Attitudes toward language learning
d. Opportunities for improvement of their French proficiency at post-secondary institutions

The proposed two year extension of the pilot study would build on the work done, allowing both post-testing of the K-71 cohort in the third year of university studies and the gathering of data on the K-72-73 cohorts, to replicate the pilot study. It would also provide baseline data on the K-74 cohort for subsequent follow-ups.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Ottawa area students in the K-71 cohort and Out-of-town students tested in the pilot study would be contacted for the 1986-87 Annual follow-up and for post-testing in 1987-88.

Students from the K-72 and K-73 cohorts in the Ottawa and Carleton Boards of Education schools and/or at the University of Ottawa would serve as sample populations for replication of the pilot study and try-out of supplementary instruments in 1987.

Students in the K-74 cohort at the grade 13 level or in the fall of their first post-secondary year would be pre-tested in 1988 (with proposed post-testing in 1991)

It would be desirable to extend the study under separate funding to post-immersion students in other provinces and in other parts of Ontario.

Instruments

The Revised Battery described in Chapter IV will be used in the logitudinal study, consisting of the following instruments. (See also Appendices C-E of this Report).

Group Test of French Proficiency

Listening Comprehension
Reading Comprehension
Cloze Test
Dictation

Individual Speaking Test

Three parts with total possible score of 15

Self-Report Inventories

Self-Assessment Questionnaire
French Language Use Questionnaire (with part scores)

An Annual Follow-up Questionnaire will also be devised. It is also our intention to add several other measures to the battery, particularly those related to speaking or writing which would yield research information on the characteristics of interlanguage development for this population.

Overview of Plan for the Calendar Years 1986-87 and 1987-88

1986-87 Tracing of K-72 and K-73 cohorts. Try-out of Revised Battery and supplementary (language acquisition research) instruments in the Ottawa area

Arrangements for parallel studies in other areas and provinces (e.g. elsewhere in Ontario, in New Brunswick, in British Columbia, etc.), where numbers warrant and funding can be found , using the same instruments and comparable procedures.

Continuation of tracing of K-71 and K-74 cohorts

Annual follow-up of K-71 cohort with mail-out evaluation instruments and archival data-gathering in universities

1987-88 Post-testing of K-71 cohort in the third post-secondary year, with measures of French proficiency, language use, attitudes, and plans for the future.

Pre-testing of the K-74 cohort in grade 13 or in the following fall in the Ottawa area, using the same measures as for the K-71 cohort (Revised Battery)

Update of description of university offerings for former immersion students in Eastern Ontario and at McGill.

REFERENCES

Clément, R., Smythe, P.C., and Gardner, R.C. Echelles d'attitudes et de motivation reliées a l'apprentissage de l'anglais, langue seconde.' Canadian Modern Language Review: 34(4), 688-694, 1978.

Commissioner of Official Languages. Annual Report. Government of Canada, Ottawa. 1985.

Edwards,H., Wesche,M., Krashen,S., Clément,R., and Kruidenier,B. 'Second-Language Acquisition Through Subject-Matter Learning: A Study of Sheltered Psychology Classes at the University of Ottawa.' Canadian Modern Language Review : 41 (2): 268-282, 1984.

LeBlanc, R. and Painchaud, G. Self-Assessment as a Second Language Placement Test. Tesol Quarterly: 19 (4) : 673-687, 1985.

McGillivray, W.R. Senior students and French - How do they rate themselves? In W.R. McGillivray (Ed.), More French S'il vous plaît. Canadian Parents for French, Ottawa, 1986.

McGillivray, W.R. and Pawley, C. Grade 13 Student Survey 1985. Unpublished questionnaire, Ottawa Board of Education, 1985.

Modern Language Centre, OISE. French Immersion at the Post-Secondary Level : Developing an Agenda for Research. Final Report for the Ontario Ministry of Education, 1985.

Morrison,F. and Pawley,C. French Proficiency of Immersion Students at the Grade 12 Level. Ontario Ministry of Education. Toronto, 1986.

Swain,M. and Lapkin,S.Evaluating Bilingual Education : A Canadian Case Study. Clevedon, Avon : Multilingual Matters Ltd. 1982.

Wesche, M.B. Immersion and the Universities. Canadian Modern Language Review. 41 (5) : 956-961, 1985.

Appendix A

Survey of Immersion Programs Followed

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

OTTAWA ONTARIO CANADA

TO ALL PRE-UNIVERSITY AND FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS:-
If you have ever been in a French immersion program please fill out the following:

NAME: _____ **FACULTY:** _____ **PROGRAM/YEAR:** _____

CURRENT ADDRESS: _____ Student Number: _____

_____ Telephone: _____
Postal Code

Please indicate the grades, school board and city in which you were enrolled in each of the following French programs. Complete as many as are applicable to you.

French Program	Grades	School Board and City
NO FRENCH AT ALL	__ to __	
CORE FRENCH (20 mins. per day) . . .	__ to __	
EXTENDED FRENCH (Core French plus one subject in French)	__ to __	
LATE IMMERSION (entry at grade 6 or later)	__ to __	
EARLY OR KINDERGARTEN-ENTRY IMMERSION	__ to __	
HIGH SCHOOL BILINGUAL PROGRAM . . .	__ to __	
SCHOOL FOR FRANCOPHONES	__ to __	
Other: _____	__ to __	

_____ Date of High School Graduation: _____

We would appreciate it if you would fill out a self-assessment questionnaire for French even though you may also wish to take the French proficiency test.
(Room 201 Montpetit Hall, during registration)

Please give one other address and telephone number through which you could be reached during the next few years. It could be that of a close relative or friend who would not be likely to move in the near future.

Address: _____ Telephone: _____

_____
Postal Code

Institut de langues vivantes
Faculté des arts

600 King Edward
K1N 6N5
(613) 231-2973

Centre for Second Language Learning
Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa Tracing Questionnaire (Under Revision)

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

OTTAWA ONTARIO CANADA K1N 6N5

Institutional Planning Office

For students who have been in a French Immersion program

The University of Ottawa is most interested in providing as much as possible course offerings that meet students' demand. With respect to courses to be taught in French and the teaching of French as a second language, we wish to get more information from you to assist us in our planning.

Please complete this questionnaire and return it along with your Offer of Admission. All responses will be kept confidential; the Institutional Planning office will only disclose aggregate statistics.

STUDENT NUMBER: _____ **YEAR OF BIRTH:** 19__ __

1. Please indicate the grades, school board and city in which you were enrolled in each of the following French programs. Complete as many as are applicable to you.

French Program	Grades	School Board	City
a. No French at all	__to__	_____	_____
b. Core French (20 mins. per day)	__to__	_____	_____
c. Extended French (Core French + one subject in French)	__to__	_____	_____
d. Late Immersion (entry at grade 6 or later)	__to__	_____	_____
e. Early or Kindergarten-Entry Immersion	__to__	_____	_____
f. High School Bilingual Program	__to__	_____	_____
g. School for Francophones	__to__	_____	_____
h. Other (specify): _____	__to__	_____	_____

2. Please write your year of High School Graduation: 19__ __

OVER

Appendix C

Speaking Test Scoring Guidelines

Rating 1: Although sentences may be produced, speech is halting and erratic. Vocabulary is elementary, trivial, repetitive and shows frequent errors. Grammar also has many errors and shows little control in many or most major patterns, although some short phrases may be correct. Almost every utterance contains fractured syntax and other grammatical errors. The accent and pronunciation may be inconsistent and faltering with poor intonation.

Rating 2: Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky, but the student manages to rephrase and continue, sometimes with inconsistent or incomplete passages. Although there is general accuracy in basic grammatical construction, errors exist. Vocabulary is adequate for basic conversations, although the limitations of vocabulary prevent precision and more detailed conversation. Pronunciation and accent, though sometimes faulty, almost never impede meaning.

Rating 3: Speech may still be somewhat uneven, with bursts of fluency ending with a groping for words or construction. Cannot sustain coherent structures in longer more complex utterances or unfamiliar situations and the ability to give precise information is limited. Some hesitation and circumlocution or rephrasing is necessary due to the limitations of vocabulary. Has control of elementary constructions quite accurately, but errors occur in the more complex ones. Pronunciation, though not perfect, is intelligible. A fair amount of relevant information is conveyed, although not always in a manner appropriate to audience and situation.

Rating 4: Speech is generally continuous, but may include some slight hesitation or stumbling. There are only a few errors of grammar and the vocabulary is generally appropriate with a fairly good range of more precise words. There are few errors or hesitations of accent and pronunciation. Most of the relevant information is conveyed, usually in an appropriate manner.

Rating 5: Speech is natural and continuous with no grammatical errors. Any pauses correspond to those that might be made by a native speaker. Vocabulary is appropriate, extended and varied. Pronunciation is excellent. All relevant information is conveyed in a manner appropriate to the situation.

APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL DATA FOR THE REVISED PROFICIENCY TEST

TABLE A : Descriptive Statistics, Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement : Revised Version, Written French Proficiency Test

Maximum Possible Score	N	Mean	SD	Median	Range	Minimum	Maximum
60	73	40.9	10.6	42.0	46	10.0	56.0

RELIABILITY	SEm
.92	3.1

TABLE B: Item Characteristics: Revised Version, Written French Proficiency Test

Number of Examinees = 73

ITEM	Point Biserial	Biserial	Facility	Discrimination
1	0.189	0.263	0.77	.20
2	0.390	0.500	0.64	.50
3	0.280	0.430	0.85	.20
4	0.488	0.644	0.70	.55
5	0.553	0.748	0.74	.65
6	0.437	0.550	0.56	.60
7	0.293	0.375	0.62	.30
8	0.318	0.442	0.77	.45
9	0.255	0.428	0.90	.15
10	0.570	0.715	0.47	.70
11	0.253	0.353	0.78	.25
12	0.272	0.369	0.75	.40
13	0.336	0.468	0.77	.35
14	0.367	0.477	0.68	.35
15	0.488	0.623	0.62	.65
16	0.581	0.731	0.45	.80
17	0.184	0.257	0.78	.25
18	0.465	0.627	0.73	.50
19	0.056	0.074	0.70	.10
20	0.491	0.628	0.63	.50
21	0.176	0.221	0.49	.25
22	0.306	0.404	0.29	.40
23	0.438	0.579	0.71	.45
24	0.480	0.612	0.62	.55
25	0.085	0.113	0.29	.20

ITEM	Point Biserial	Biserial	Facility	Discrimination
26	0.221	0.322	0.82	.25
27	0.589	0.826	0.79	.55
28	0.613	0.784	0.37	.75
29	0.459	0.642	0.78	.50
30	0.368	0.461	0.47	.40
31	0.156	0.345	0.95	.10
32	0.515	0.659	0.64	.55
33	0.512	0.645	0.44	.60
34	0.622	0.780	0.52	.75
35	0.569	0.795	0.78	.55
36	0.160	0.224	0.79	.05
37	0.599	0.778	0.68	.65
38	0.596	0.772	0.34	.75
39	0.575	1.082	0.93	.25
40	0.561	0.742	0.71	.70
41	0.585	0.981	0.90	.35
42	0.246	0.310	0.58	.35
43	0.434	0.633	0.82	.40
44	0.564	0.732	0.67	.60
45	0.585	0.817	0.78	.60
46	0.313	0.397	0.41	.40
47	0.582	0.899	0.86	.45
48	0.378	0.549	0.81	.35
49	0.368	0.612	0.89	.20
50	0.602	0.924	0.85	.50
51	0.368	0.499	0.25	.50
52	0.187	0.234	0.51	.30
53	0.352	0.585	0.89	.20
54	0.414	0.688	0.89	.25
55	0.572	0.717	0.53	.75
56	0.413	0.630	0.84	.30
57	0.330	0.553	0.90	.20
58	0.547	0.908	0.89	.40
59	0.465	0.603	0.68	.55
60	0.568	0.718	0.58	.70

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT READING TEXT AND DICTATION

The item characteristics of the proposed reading text, field tested together with one of the readings retained in the revised battery (items 15 to 19 in Table B) are presented below in Table C. For comparison purposes, the new reading text questions are items 1 to 4 and the retained reading text questions are items 5 to 9.

The dictation is part of a proficiency test battery which was administered to 257 grade 12 immersion students in the spring of 1984. Two methods of scoring were used:

Method 1 required exact reproduction of a word including spelling in order to be corrected as correct.

Method 2 required only that the word be understood and placed in its correct context in order to be counted as correct.

Scoring Inter-rater Reliability : 0.98

Using Method I, the mean of the group was 68.2, with a range of 30-106

Using Method 2, the mean of the group was 87.8, with a range of 34-112.

TABLE C : Item Characteristics : Proposed Reading Text and Retained Reading Text

Item	Point Biserial	Biserial	Facility	Discrimination
1	0.354	0.458	0.66	.25
2	0.348	0.442	0.61	.42
3	0.262	0.386	0.18	.25
4	0.490	0.618	0.57	.67
5*	0.610	0.775	0.39	.75
6	0.213	0.321	0.16	.17
7	0.513	0.646	0.55	.67
8	0.733	0.930	0.39	.92
9	0.466	0.588	0.57	.58

N=44

* Items 5-9 are items 15-19 in Table B. It is apparent from an examination of the facilities obtained from these items on the two occasions that the population tested here is not as proficient as that which yielded the results reported in Table B.

Appendix E

Revised French Language Use Questionnaire

Post-Secondary
French Language Use
1986

This questionnaire is designed to provide useful guidelines to assist the university in developing suitable courses for those students who wish to maintain or improve their second language skills at a post-secondary level. It is also part of a follow-up study being conducted jointly by the University of Ottawa and the Research Centre of the Ottawa Board of Education.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest confidence. Although we ask for your name, we do so only because we must be able to associate your responses to this questionnaire with other data.

For the results of this survey to be meaningful, it is important that you be as accurate and as frank as possible. If you need more room to answer any question, use the back of the paper, marking clearly the number of the question you are responding to.

Name: _____

University: _____

University Student Number: _____

Using the scale outlined below please circle the appropriate number to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Slightly disagree
(3) Slightly agree
(4) Strongly agree

		Disagree		Agree	
1.	I would feel uncomfortable speaking French in any situation.	1	2	3	4
2.	I would feel confident if I had to ask street directions in French.	1	2	3	4
3.	I would be nervous if I had to speak French to a sales clerk.	1	2	3	4
4.	I would feel sure of myself if I had to use French in ordering a meal.	1	2	3	4
5.	I would feel comfortable in carrying on a friendly conversation with a French-speaking student.	1	2	3	4
6.	I would feel comfortable speaking French in an informal gathering where both English and French speaking people were present.	1	2	3	4
7.	I would get flustered if it were necessary to speak French while making a telephone call.	1	2	3	4
8.	If I had to speak French with someone in authority at the university I would feel very uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4
9.	I would feel comfortable participating in a class discussion in French on a familiar topic.	1	2	3	4
10.	I would be nervous if I had to speak French in a seminar with French-speaking students.	1	2	3	4

Please mark the box beside the statement that best describes what you would normally do.

11. If there were French-speaking families in my neighbourhood, or students in my residence, I would:

- ☐ speak French with them as much as possible.
- ☐ speak French with them sometimes.
- ☐ never speak French with them.

12. If I had the opportunity to speak French in a store, I would:

- ☐ never speak it.
- ☐ speak it occasionally, using English whenever possible.
- ☐ speak French most of the time, using English only if really necessary.

13. If a French play or movie sounded interesting and I felt I knew enough French, I would:

- ☐ definitely go.
- ☐ go only if I had nothing else to do.
- ☐ not go.

14. I have found studying the French language (as opposed to learning a subject in French):

- ☐ very interesting.
- ☐ no more interesting than most subjects.
- ☐ not interesting at all.

15. If I felt I knew enough French, I would read French magazines and newspapers:

- ☐ as often as I could.
- ☐ not very often
- ☐ never.

16. If I felt I knew enough French, I would watch French T.V. programs:

- ☐ never.
- ☐ sometimes.
- ☐ as often as possible.

17. When I hear a French song on the radio, I:

- ☐ change the station.
- ☐ listen mainly to the music, paying some attention to the words.
- ☐ listen carefully and try to understand all the words.

18. When a stranger says something to me in French, I usually:

- ☐ answer in English.
- ☐ start to answer in French but switch to English as soon as I have trouble.
- ☐ try to answer completely in French.

19. When you are with French-speaking people, would you like them to think that French is your first language?

- ☐ Yes.
- ☐ No.
- ☐ It doesn't mattter to me.

How important is each of the reasons given below for learning French? Circle the appropriate number opposite each reason, according to your opinion of its importance.

(1) Not at all important
(2) Slightly important
(3) Moderately important
(4) Very important

	Unimportant		Important	
20. Learning French will help me to improve my job possibilities.	1	2	3	4
21. Knowing French will make it easier for me to travel in French-speaking areas.	1	2	3	4
22. It is interesting to know more than one language.	1	2	3	4
23. In Canada people who know the two official languages can contribute to national unity.	1	2	3	4
24. Knowing the French language makes it easy to get to know people who are French speaking.	1	2	3	4

For each of the following situations, please indicate how often <u>you</u> use French.

	Never or hardly ever	Sometimes	About half the time	Most or all of the time
25. Talking with the professor during French classes	1	2	3	4
26 At university, between classes or at lunch	1	2	3	4
27. At home, with relatives or friends	1	2	3	4
28. Talking with francophones in the community	1	2	3	4
29 While working at a part- or full-time job	1	2	3	4

30. Please indicate how the amount you are using French this year compares to the amount you used during your last year of secondary school in the following situations.

	More than	The same	Less than
While at work	☐	☐	☐
While in class	☐	☐	☐
In social situations	☐	☐	☐

31. Please estimate the amount of French you intend to use in the immediate future compared to your present use.

	More than	The same	Less than
At work	☐	☐	☐
At university	☐	☐	☐
In social situations	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate, for both English and French, the number of books you read, movies you watch, etc. in an average month.

		Average per month	
		English	French
32.	Number of books read (excluding school books)	_____	_____
33.	Number of movies, videos or plays seen	_____	_____
34.	Number of hours of television watched (excluding videos)	_____	_____

35. Please indicate below any other activities in which you use French (e.g. sports, organizations, etc.).

	Hours per month
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

36. In what faculty, school or department are you registered?

_____

37. What is your programme or intended area of concentration?

_____

38. Is it a three or four year programme? _____

39. Are you currently taking any of the following types of courses? **Check as many as apply and then specify title, course code if possible, duration (e.g. 3 month, 6 month), number of hours per week and/or number of credits awarded for the course.**

☐ French as a second language _____

_____

_____

☐ Courses for Anglophones in Lettres françaises/French Language and Literature

_____

_____

☐ Academic courses for Francophones _____

_____

_____

☐ Academic courses in French designed for Anglophones, e.g. sheltered courses, courses with a discussion group/tutorial in French

_____

_____

40. What difference has participation in a French immersion programme made to you?

41. How important do you think your knowledge of French will be to your future career? **Please circle one.**

(1) Not at all important

(2) Slightly important

(3) Moderately important

(4) Very important

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Thank you for your cooperation.

ABSTRACT

Post-Secondary Follow-up of Former French Immersion Students in the Ottawa Area*

Wesche, M., F. Morrison, C. Pawley and D. Ready, 1986.
Ottawa: University of Ottawa, Centre for Second Language Learning.
(30 tables, 93 pp. incl. appendices).

The report summarizes findings of a pilot study of 1985 graduates of bilingual high school programs, including 81 graduates from the Ottawa and Carleton Boards of Education (OBE, CBE) who had previously completed early or late immersion programs, and who entered a nearby university (University of Ottawa, Carleton, Queens or McGill). A second group of 22 subjects came from bilingual high school programs in other parts of Canada and entered the University of Ottawa in 1985. Some findings are also reported for 922 English language students entering the University of Ottawa in 1986, including 180 graduates of bilingual high school programs, the majority from the OBE and CBE.

Baseline data are reported for the 1985 samples on French language proficiency, attitudes toward the French language, and current patterns of French use at university. Comparative findings are also reported for the OBE/CBE subsamples who attended early immersion (N=33) versus late immersion (N=48) programs, and for those attending the University of Ottawa (N=34) or Carleton (N=28). The OBE/CBE and Out-of-Town groups at the University of Ottawa are also compared.

A major objective of the study was to develop and refine a methodology and battery of instruments for follow-up studies of post-secondary immersion graduates, to be made available to researchers throughout Canada. Procedures and instruments are described in detail for the tracing and location of subjects, measurement and self-evaluation of French proficiency, and archival data-gathering in the post-secondary institutions.

The study had the further objective of describing the current response of the four post-secondary institutions to this growing clientele of bilingual anglophone students. French language course offerings, including French as a second language, French literature, and other academic disciplines taught in French are considered. Other opportunities to use French, academic exchanges, and special instances of institutional support for and recognition of advanced level French language activity are also detailed.

The report includes a proposal for a continuation of the follow-up of the pilot OBE/CBE group (known as the Kindergarten-71 cohort) and a later group (the K-74 cohort).

---

*The project was funded by the Language Acquisition Development Program, Official Languages in Education, of the Department of the Secretary of State.

Findings: student samples

These bilingual high school graduates demonstrate high levels of functional proficiency in all language skills, and high levels of self-confidence about their listening and reading skills. They report relatively low anxiety when using French, as well as a strong desire to use it and to continue improving their skills. On the other hand, the actual frequency with which most of them actually use French is quite low, either in their first-year university studies or in leisure pursuits. There are, however, some significant differences among the sub-samples studied.

Early vs. Late Immersion: Analysis of variance revealed that early immersion students perform better than late immersion students on listening and speaking tests. There are, however, no significant differences on any written measures. Early immersion students also rate themselves higher on listening and reading skills, and report lower anxiety levels when using French. They report significantly more frequent use of French, although none of the specific measures of use show a difference between the two groups. Thus early immersion students appear to have some advantage in face-to-face French use, but the differences are not large, and late immersion students do not appear to be disadvantaged with respect to those French skills most related to the academic environment.

Institutional differences: There are a few significant, but again relatively minor, differences in the subsamples attending Ottawa's bilingual University of Ottawa and English language Carleton University. The U. of Ottawa students perform better on the Speaking Test, and also evaluate themselves higher on functional listening and speaking skills. The two groups differ most in their current use of French, with the U. of Ottawa students reporting more change in their patterns of French use. Not surprisingly, they take more courses in French (an average of .8 vs. .4 during first-year studies). While the university entry level differences are minimal between these two subsamples, a longitudinal study might be expected to reveal an increasing gap between them because of the difference in opportunities to use French in the two institutions.

University of Ottawa: The OBE/CBE and Out-of-Town subsamples of bilingual high school graduates at the University of Ottawa do not differ on either the French proficiency tests or self-evaluation. They show one interesting difference in reasons for learning French; the Out-of-Town students give significantly greater weight to the importance of bilingualism for national unity. These students also report much greater frequency of French use than do the Ottawa area students, both in and out of class. These findings suggest that the University of Ottawa attracts an identifiable group of functionally bilingual Anglophone students from other parts of Canada at least partly because of its bilingual context and offerings in French.

A questionnaire sent to English language students entering the University of Ottawa in 1986 identified 180 graduates of bilingual high school programs, including 102 who had completed a full sequence of either early or late immersion plus bilingual high school (as compared with the 56 identified in 1985). Two-thirds (66%) of the 922 respondents said they intended to continue French study at the University of Ottawa; Of these, 40% intended to take "some" or "most" of their courses in French, and the rest,

"one or two." Most gave personal interest as their main reason for studying in French, with academic program and career reasons also of importance to a large number of them. The main reason given for not continuing French study was the fear that it would be detrimental to academic marks.

Findings: institutional offerings:

In all four institutions, at least some officials were identified who were aware of the special characteristics of entering immersion students and who were formulating plans for meeting their needs. If a demand for subject-matter courses in French for Anglophones materializes, all four institutions have declared or demonstrated themselves willing to offer them, the University of Ottawa and Queen's having already made major efforts in this direction. The main concern at the moment is that students, because of other priorities, may not create sufficient demand to make such courses viable. Other initiatives to date include: Carleton's active encouragement of French use in academic work and tentative plans for a "mention française" for bilingual students who do part of their studies in French; Queens' position of a bilingualism coordinator, French Floors in residences, and establishment of laboratory and tutorial sections in French, and the University of Ottawa's "sheltered" and "adjunct" courses in various disciplines for second language speakers as a transition to courses offered in French fro francophones, and the questionnaire to incoming English language students on their French language background and aspirations.

Availability of Test Battery

For information on the Speaking Test contact:

Dr. F. Morrison or Mrs. C. Pawley
Ottawa Board of Education Research Centre
330 Gilmour Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0P9

For information on the written French Proficiency Test, the French Self-Assessment and the Language Use Questionnaire, contact:

Mrs. D. Ready or Dr. M. Wesche
Centre for Second Language Learning
University of Ottawa
600 King Edward Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5
(613) - 564 - 2973

Copies of the full report are available for $10. from

Mrs. D. Ready
Centre for Second Language Learning
University of Ottawa
600 King Edward Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5

(cheques should be made out to the CSLL, U. of Ottawa).